

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Monday, 13th September, 2021, 18:30**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Gideon Bull, Dana Carlin and Eldridge Culverwell**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Ian Sygrave**

## **89. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein'.

## **90. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Ogiehor, Emery and Amin.

## **91. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

## **92. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

## **93. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

The Committee received a deputation from a group of residents in relation to Agenda Item 9, Briefing on the Changes to Waste Legislation, including the implications for both waste reduction and recycling in Haringey. The deputation also related to specific concerns about the Edmonton Incinerator proposals. The deputation party was made up of Sydney Charles, Helen Mayer and Carmel Cadden. The following points were put forward as part of the deputation:

Reduction and Recycling.

The new legislation would render Haringey's 2021 Reduction and Recycling submission to the GLA obsolete and the amount of residual waste for incineration would be drastically reduced going forward.

The deputation party put forward the following questions:

- How could the Council monitor and influence how North London Waste would advance its waste management and adapt to resulting reductions in residual waste.

- When would Haringey update its Reduction and Recycling Plan with its target of 38% recycling by 2022, which it now says it would not meet.
- Would Haringey apply for an exemption to continue co-mingling?
- How would Haringey use income from the Extended Producer Responsibility Scheme and 'new burdens' compensation?
- How did Haringey propose to facilitate the following:
  - more local and in-store collection including Deposit Return?
  - community drinks container collections?
  - practical advice around more waste separation?
  - food waste collection from all estates?
  - plastic film collection?
  - engaging residents?
  - engaging community organisations to help with implementation?

### Edmonton Incinerator

It was suggested that there were already widespread concerns about overcapacity of the new Incinerator, due to major changes since its inception in 2015. The new legislation would reduce residual waste and increase over-capacity even more.

The Mayor's Office had already estimated a 950,000 tonne surplus for the London Region. Drinks containers would go on the Deposit Return route

Concerns were raised that there was not enough flexibility in the new design to adjust to reductions in residual waste - because the number of treatment streams had been reduced from 5 to 2. It was contended that NLWA planned to import waste if local supplies reduce.

There were other serious concerns including carbon emissions, ultra-fine particle pollution, and fewer circular economy jobs. As a result, it was felt that the current design was increasingly environmentally and financially unsustainable. However, there was an opportunity to review, adapt and future-proof the scheme going forwards.

The Deputation Party requested that:

1. The Panel addressed the above questions about Haringey Reduction and Recycling in relation to new legislation.
2. The Panel referred concerns about the incinerator to the main Scrutiny Panel, recommending that they instructed Haringey's North London Waste Authority representatives to call for it to adapt and future-proof the scheme in line with latest Defra and GLA remodelling.

The Chair thanked the deputation party for their presentation and advised that she would put the questions that were within the purview of the Council, rather than the NLWA to officers for a written response and that the NLWA would be invited to a subsequent meeting of the panel to respond to the points around the incinerator.  
**(Action: Clerk).**

#### 94. MINUTES

##### RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> June were agreed as a correct record.

#### 95. CABINET MEMBER Q&A - CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER SERVICE, WELFARE AND THE PUBLIC REALM

This agenda item was withdrawn as the Cabinet Member had to take a period of leave at short notice.

#### 96. WASTE, RECYCLING AND STREET CLEANSING PERFORMANCE

The Committee received a written report which provided an update on the Council's Waste Recycling and Street Cleansing Performance. The report was included in the agenda pack at pages 11-30 and was introduced by Beth Waltzer, Interim Head of Waste. The following arose during the discussion of the report:

- a. The Committee sought assurances around whether officers were satisfied with the current standard of street cleansing. In response, officers advised that the council regularly monitored standards through the NI195 Performance measure and that Veolia were meeting their contracted targets. In relation to an anecdotal account of a street sweeper having to stop cleaning a particular location to cover shortages in other areas, officers advised that this would be an unusual occurrence and that street sweeping offer was made up of a mixture of dedicated beat sweepers and roving sweepers that covered multiple locations.
- b. The Panel commented that although criticism for cleanliness standards tended to be levied at Veolia, the Council, and the Councillors that sat on the Council, were responsible for large cuts to the budget for waste and street cleansing. A Panel member commented that more needed to be done to incentivise people to take more responsibility for the waste they produced, both in terms of positive incentives and negative reinforcement, such as FPNs. It was suggested that the Council needed to find ways of bringing back civic pride and that a campaign should be launched to this effect. The example of Canterbury Council was given and a communication campaign based around a message that 'this is your area' was put forward. In relation to comms messages around dumping, officers agreed to send Cllr Bull a copy of the Cleaner Haringey Strategy. **(Action: Beth Waltzer).**
- c. The Panel raised concerns about dumping and bin provision on Somerset Gardens. The Panel also noted concerns about estates that were managed by more than one provider, leading to a lack of accountability for waste management. In response, officers advised that they were aware of the problem and were working with HfH to enforce against third party owners such as housing associations. However, officers acknowledged that this was a difficult process. Officers agreed to speak to the Area Manager and provide an update on Somerset Gardens and the next steps to improve this location. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm).**

- d. The Panel welcomed the roll-out of bins for flats above shops and advocated that they would like to see this done more quickly. Officers acknowledged that they would love to be able to roll this out even quicker but cautioned that there was a lot of work involved in understanding what was required along with undertaking an impact assessment and consulting with key stakeholders, such as Veolia, Highways, businesses and the residents themselves. Officers assured Members that they would roll this about as quickly as was practicable.
- e. The Panel set out that they would like to see a widening of the shutter gallery project to improve the look and feel of local businesses. Officers advised that they were working closely with colleagues in Regen on this project and would feed back to Regen colleagues about the request to widened it out to more locations, including Broad Lane.
- f. The Panel queried the reasons behind a drop in the recycling rate to 31.8%. Officers advised that a significant reason for this was around legislative changes on no longer being able to recycle certain materials that had already been recycled. The Panel was also advised that the introduction of chargeable garden waste had been a contributing factor.
- g. The Panel questioned whether any analysis had been done of the relationship between the per capita number of businesses in a borough and the amount of flytipping/recycling that took place. In response, officers advised that they were not aware of any specific benchmarking on this for different boroughs. Following further questions around fly-tipping and dumped bags of clothes, officers advised that they would circulate a breakdown of the make-up of fly tips in the borough. **(Action: Beth Waltzer).**
- h. In relation to what checks were done to ensure that wheelie bins were being put back in the correct place, officers advised that this formed part of the contract monitoring that was undertaken. There were two contract monitoring officers who monitored all of the relevant performance measures.
- i. In relation to garden waste, officers advised that the NLWA undertook a waste compilation study previously and that another study would likely be undertaken in due course. Officers set out that the fly-tipping breakdown would also show dumped garden waste.
- j. The Panel commented that there seemed to be increasing numbers of bins left on the pavement in and around the Ladders, which was not so prevalent 12 months ago. The Panel questioned whether this was perhaps related to new teams being in place which were not familiar with the location or whether there were additional time pressures on the crews. In response, officers acknowledged that there were a lot of new staff, partly as a result of the national shortage of drivers and that this had led to a number of agency staff being used who were less familiar with the routes
- k. Officers advised that the new Veolia Waste Manager for the west of the borough was Jennifer Barrett.
- l. The Panel raised concerns about blocked drains following the heavy flooding earlier in the summer and that there had been a number of complaints about basement levels flooding, especially in and around Stroud Green. In response, officers advised that they were aware of blocked gulley's due to detritus and that there was a programme in place to unblock them. However, they were not aware of the flooding issue and requested that members email them with further details.

- m. Members requested that drains in areas that experienced flooding be prioritised going forwards.
- n. The Chair noted that in Staffordshire Veolia had successfully rolled out the separate collection of paper and card recycling which had saved the authority a significant amount of money due to a reduction in those waste streams being contaminated by broken glass. Officers advised that this could potentially be a different proposition to implement in an inner-London Borough than a more rural English county. Officers acknowledged that this would be something that they would look at as part of a range of possible measures to improve recycling when they undertook the service review.

## **RESOLVED**

That Members noted the contents of the report.

### **97. BRIEFING ON CHANGES TO WASTE LEGISLATION**

The Committee received a written report which provided an update on changes to waste legislation, namely; the Extended Producer Responsibility Consultation (EPR) 2021, the Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) 2021 and the Household and Business Consistency in Recycling Consultation 2021. The report was introduced by Beth Waltzer, Interim Head of Waste as set out at pages 31-46 of the agenda pack. The following arose during the discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel noted that the Veolia contract was due for renewal in 2025 and that these legislative changes were due to come into force in 2023. The Panel suggested that the authority needed to factor these into the contract specification work and sought assurances around what was being done to prepare for this. In response, officers advised that a broad analysis was being undertaken to assess these changes and that discussions were taking place with partners and the NLWA on this. Officers commented that Veolia had shown significant flexibility with previous changes to the contract, such as those around the vehicle specifications and it was hoped that this would continue in the future. In addition, it was suggested that Veolia were a large company specialising in waste management and that they would be having their own discussions at a senior level on how to respond to these legislative changes.
- b. In regard to a follow-up question around separating out paper and cardboard recycling, officers advised that the process of looking at what was required in the new contract was being looked at, but that the specifications needed to be looked at as a whole. For example, any separation of dry recycling would require vehicles with additional compartments and would need consideration of transportation to a greater number of waste centres and the logistics/costs involved.
- c. In response to comments from the Panel, officers acknowledged that this wasn't the first time that the government had mooted changes to waste collection and that the Council's would have to keep an eye on how the process unfolded.
- d. In response to a concern about the shortage of drivers and newspaper reports of supermarkets paying huge wage increases to secure LGV drivers, officers acknowledged that this was a problem, but that Haringey had not been as badly affected as some other authorities. Officers were working with Veolia to

address this issue but, as it was a national issue, it was suggested that it may get worse before it got better.

## **RESOLVED**

The report was noted.

### **98. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REVIEW INTO BLUE BADGES AND SUPPORTING BETTER ACCESS TO PARKING FOR DISABLED PEOPLE**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on implementation of the recommendations of the Scrutiny review on Blue Badges and Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People agreed by Cabinet in October 2020. The report was introduced by Ann Cunningham, Head of Highways and Parking as set out in the agenda pack at pages 51-98. The following arose as part of the discussion of the report:

- a. In response to a question about whether there was a database of redundant disabled parking bays, officers advised that the new Parking Management IT System included the functionality for this. Officers commented that this was an area that had the potential to create objections from residents and that it was important to keep the information up to date. Officers cautioned that the reallocation of bays was done in batches because there was a cost associated with issuing the notices and that reallocating the bays, therefore, could take a bit of time.
- b. The Panel welcomed the introduction of companion badges questioned what more could be done to advertise the presence of the companion badge scheme to residents. In response, officers set out that virtual permits had been introduced to prevent Blue Badge theft. Their introduction had seen an increase in their usage and seemed to be popular with residents. Officers commented that the permits were currently only valid for the home CPZ, but following feedback from residents, the Parking Service were expanding these to be valid borough wide.
- c. Officers advised that Panel that going forwards the companion badges would be called disabled parking permits and a key area of focus would be around trying to prevent parking on yellow lines.
- d. In response to a specific case, a member of the Panel urged officers to ensure that they were liaising with TfL about the use of companion badges and their issuing parking tickets to residents with companion badges on TfL managed roads. Officers acknowledged this point and assured members that they liaised with TfL on this.
- e. The Chair commented that she had not received any casework in relation to Blue Badges in some time and that was clearly a reflection that the service was working well.

## **RESOLVED**

The contents of the report were noted.

## **99. UPDATE ON PARKING TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME.**

The Panel received a written report which provided an update on the Parking Transformation Programme. The report was introduced by Ann Cunningham and Tim Gunn, Parking Compliance Manager, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 103 to 120. The following arose as part of the discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel noted previous concerns from residents who found the parking pages of the website difficult to navigate and sought assurances that the new Parking Management IT System had improved this. Officers advised that they were confident that it had as residents could now get their permits instantly, but that it would be best to wait for the system to bed in in order to ascertain whether there were any issues.
- b. The Panel noted a general rising trend of the number of PCNs issued from April to August but questioned a drop in the number for August. In response, officers advised that there was a lag between PCNs being issued and the fine being paid. The drop was likely a reflection of a backlog of PCN's being processed through the Civica system up until the switchover on 6<sup>th</sup> April, the rising numbers reflected those PCN's transitioning through the system and then a decrease as it evened out.
- c. In response to a question on how the pricing for permits was set and whether benchmarking was undertaken, officers advised that benchmarking was undertaken whenever significant increases were made such as the diesel surcharge. Officers advised that, when looking at changing the cost, officers would ensure that they were satisfied that the pricing structure was appropriate for Haringey and was also in line with neighbouring authorities.
- d. In response to a question on CPZs, officers advised that in principle they would be happy to scale back the timings of a CPZ if that was what the majority of residents wanted, however they were not aware of any instances of residents requesting this. Officers set out that they would need to examine any future requests in the round and that there may be circumstances where this was inappropriate, such as if the street was in the centre of a busy CPZ and removing restrictions would result in it being clogged up with overspill from neighbouring streets.
- e. The Panel welcomed the introduction of cashless parking and suggested that other locations such as shopping thoroughfares would benefit. The Panel urged officers to liaise with the relevant Cabinet Member to deliver further rollout.
- f. The Panel requested an update on the abandoned vehicles contract for estates. In response, officers advised that the Parking Service were liaising with HfH about helping them manage their own parking arrangements on estates. HfH were beginning the process of rolling out controls under the Traffic Management Act, including abandoned vehicles and parking restrictions.
- g. In relation to recent cases of residents trying to get round having a valid parking permit by covering their vehicles with a protective cover, officers advised that they had previously received legal advice that CEO's could lift the covers to check. Officers set out that this was only undertaken by staff above a certain level.

- h. In response to comments about illegal crossovers and the fines being very small, officers acknowledged that the relevant powers were 41 years old and that the fines were now not commensurate with the costs of installing an illegal crossover. The Panel was advised that the DfT were being lobbied by local government bodies to look into overhauling the relevant sections of the Highways Act 1980.
- i. In relation to concerns about people giving false addresses to the DVLA and the fact that the DVLA did not ask for proof of address when registering a vehicle, officers advised that London Councils might be the most appropriate forum to raise this issue.
- j. In response to concerns about specific cases of residents cars being blocked on estates, the Panel noted that this would be an issue to be picked up with HfH.
- k. The panel questioned whether PCNs issued for vehicle usage in a schools streets area was monitored. The Panel also sought assurances around whether the fines were issued for vehicles that entered the area in error and subsequently turned around. In response, officers advised that they were looking to improve the design of signage for Schools Streets schemes to make it more visible, in advance of eight schemes going live this month. The Panel was advised that the legal requirement was for one sign to indicate the start of the scheme, however Haringey installed two along with two advanced warning signs.
- l. The Panel suggested that an officer should drive the route of each scheme to check the signage.
- m. In relation to a query around whether the infrastructure was in place to support increased numbers of electric bikes and car sharing schemes, officers advised that this was being undertaken Transport Planning colleagues.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel noted the content of the report.

### **100. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Chair set out that she would like the Panel to focus its Scrutiny Review work on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and that the review should focus on how and where they worked well and what lessons could be learned from schemes elsewhere. In particular the Chair noted concerns about the general lack of engagement and consultation that was undertaken with Liveable Crouch End.

The Panel were supportive of this as a topic and general approach. The Panel would circulate round further comments via email when the scoping document was circulated.

## **RESOLVED**

That the work plan for the Panel was noted.

### **101. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**



N/A

**102. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

11<sup>th</sup> November 2021

14<sup>th</sup> December 2021

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....